From: PETERSON Jenn L
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject: RE: 5/28 FT call
Date: 05/28/2008 12:24 PM

All I can say is hypothesis testing, not calibration. Understand and embrace differences between observed and predicted and when and where it occurs - don't lose that info by "calibrating".

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2008 11:58 AM
To: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Davoli.Dana@epamail.epa.gov; GAINER Tom; Grepo-Grove.Gina@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L; jeremy_buck@fws.gov; ANDERSON Jim M; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Smith.Judy@epamail.epa.gov; Koch.Kristine@epamail.epa.gov; MCCLINCY Matt; POULSEN Mike; Fuentes.Rene@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Sheldrake.Sean@epamail.epa.gov; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; csmith@parametrix.com; rgensemer@parametrix.com; rose@yakama.com; erin.madden@gmail.com; jay.field@noaa.gov; Cora.Lori@epamail.epa.gov; Ader.Mark@epamail.epa.gov; BBarquin@hk-law.com; audiehuber@ctuir.com; Lisa.Bluelake@grandronde.org; sheila@ridolfi.com; Benjamin Shorr; LavelleJM@cdm.com; Mary.Baker@noaa.gov; Michael.Karnosh@grandronde.org; FARRER David G; dallen@stratusconsulting.com; jpeers@stratusconsulting.com; triballaw@qwest.net; Bob Dexter; cunninghame@gorge.net; JMalek@parametrix.com; Madalinski.Kelly@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Fw: 5/28 FT call

Here is what I have regarding this afternoon's call on fate and transport.

Eric
----- Forwarded by Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US on 05/28/2008 11:57 AM -----

"Valerie Oster" <voster@anchorenv.com>		To
05/28/2008 11:07 AM	Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA	cc
	"Rick Applegate" <RICKA@BES.CI.PORTLAND.OR.US>, "Patty Dost \(Schwabe\)" <Pdost@Schwabe.com>, <wolffg@plu.edu>, "J Betz" <jbetz@ci.portland.or.us>, "Bob Wyatt" <rjw@nwnatural.com>, "Carl Stivers" <cstivers@anchorenv.com>, "valerie" <voster@anchorenv.com>, "Keith Pine" <kpine@anchorenv.com>, <david.ashton@portofportland.com>, <Jim.McKenna@portofportland.com>, <greveals@integral-corp.com>	Subject
		5/28 FT call

Chip, Eric,

Jim and Bob requested that I send you the following for today's call on Fate and Transport:

EPA commented on January 15, 2008 that chemical degradation rates should be set to near zero and did not recognize that degradation rates are one of a few potentially useful calibration parameters. In later discussions, EPA indicated they would prefer that a "realistic" degradation rate be chosen and applied and that model calibration need not be conducted. The LWG expressed concerns that EPA's proposed approach has larger ramifications because calibration of models is required under EPA guidance for well founded technical reasons. Discussion also included the concept of selecting a reasonable range of realistic degradation rates and that selected values in that range could be compared to empirical data as an "approximate" calibration procedure. The LWG has concerns about working with a model that is not calibrated (i.e., application of a pre-selected degradation rate).

For technical defensibility, the LWG needs to calibrate the model (with

degradation and/or other parameters such as estimated source loads) to make formal assessments of model uncertainty. The LWG could also run the model using EPA's pre-selected degradation rate values and compare those results to empirical data consistent with EPA's suggested "approximate" calibration procedure. The model run using the pre-selected degradation value that most closely approximates empirical data could then be compared to the fully calibrated model and if possible, adjusted so that a similar calibration is achieved using the pre-selected degradation value. This version of the model could then be used for various future modeling assessment purposes (e.g., evaluation of recontamination potential in the FS).

thanks
valerie

Valerie Thompson Oster
Anchor Environmental, L.L.C
6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 333
Portland, OR 97224
Phone: 503-670-1108 x19
Fax: 503-670-1128